arXiv:1301.2898v2 [math.FA] 20 Jan 2013

EXTREMAL SEQUENCES FOR THE BELLMAN FUNCTION OF THE DYADIC MAXIMAL OPERATOR

ELEFTHERIOS N. NIKOLIDAKIS

Abstract: We give a characterization of the extremal sequences for the Bellman function of the dyadic maximal operator. In fact we prove that they behave approximately like eigenfunctions of this operator for a specific eigenvalue.

1. Introduction

The dyadic maximal operator on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{M}\phi(x) = \sup\left\{\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q |\phi(u)|du : x \in Q,\ Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \text{ is a dyadic cube}\right\} \tag{1.1}$$

for every $\phi \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ where $|\cdot|$ is the Lesbesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and the dyadic cubes are those formed by the grids $2^{-N}\mathbb{Z}^n$, $N = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$.

As it is well known it satisfies the following weak type (1,1) inequality:

$$|\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathcal{M}_d\phi(x) > \lambda\}| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}\int_{\{\mathcal{M}_d\phi>\lambda\}} |\phi(u)|du, \tag{1.2}$$

for every $\phi \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\lambda > 0$.

From (1.2) it is easy to prove the following L^p-inequality

$$\|\mathcal{M}_d\phi\|_p \leq \frac{p}{p-1}\|\varphi\|_p, \tag{1.3}$$

for every $p > 1$ and $\phi \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

It is easy to see that (1.2) is best possible, while (1.3) is sharp as it can be seen in [10]. (See [1] and [2] for general martingales).

One way of studying the dyadic maximal operator is to find certain refinements of inequalities satisfied by it such as (1.2) and (1.3). Certain refinements of (1.2) have been done in [5], [6] and [7]. Refinements of (1.3) have been given in [3] or even more general in [4].

In studying (1.3) an interesting function has been introduced which is the following

$$B_p^Q(f,F) = \sup\left\{\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q (\mathcal{M}_d\phi)^p : \phi \geq 0,\ Av_Q(\phi) = f,\ Av_Q(\phi^p) = F\right\} \tag{1.4}$$

where Q is a fixed dyadic cube in $\mathbb{R}^n$, and $\phi \in L^p(Q)$

$$Av_Q(h) = \frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q |h(y)|du.$$

This is the Bellman function of two variables associated to the dyadic maximal operator.

The function given in (1.4) has been explicitly computed. Actually this is done in a much more general setting of a non-atomic probability measure space (X, μ) where the dyadic sets are now given in a family of sets $\mathcal{T}$ (called tree), which satisfies conditions similar to those that are satisfied by the dyadic cubes on $[0,1]^n$. Then the associated dyadic maximal operator $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi(x) = \sup\left\{\frac{1}{\mu(I)}\int_I |\phi| d\mu : x \in I \in \mathcal{T}\right\}, \tag{1.5}$$

for $\phi \in L^1(X, \mu)$.

Then the Bellman function of two variables for $p > 1$ associated to $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}$ is given by

$$B_p(f, F) = \sup\left\{\int_X (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi)^p d\mu : \phi \geq 0,\ \int_X \phi d\mu = f,\ \int_X \phi^p d\mu = F\right\}, \tag{1.6}$$

where $0 < f^p \leq F$.

In [3] (1.6) has been found to be equal to $B_p(f, F) = F\omega_p(f^p/F)^p$ where $\omega_p : [0,1] \longrightarrow \left[1, \frac{p}{p-1}\right]$ is the inverse function H_p^{-1} of H_p defined for $z \in \left[1, \frac{p}{p-1}\right]$ by $H_p(z) = -(p-1)z^p + pz^{p-1}$.

Recently L. Slavin and A. Stokolos [9], linked the Bellman function computation to solving certain PDEs of the Monge-Ampère type, and in this way they obtained an alternative proof of the results in [3].

In this paper we study those sequences of functions $(\phi_n)_n$ that are extremal for the Bellman function (1.6). That is $\phi_n : (X, \mu) \to \mathbb{R}^+$ must satisfy

$$\int_X \phi_n d\mu = f,\ \int_X \phi_n^p d\mu = F \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_n \int_X (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi_n)^p d\mu = F\omega_p(f^p/F)^p.$$

In [8] it is proved that every such extremal sequence must satisfy a self similar property, namely that for every $I \in \mathcal{T}$ we have that

$$\lim_n \frac{1}{\mu(I)}\int_I \phi_n d\mu = f \quad \text{and} \quad \lim \frac{1}{\mu(I)}\int_I \phi_n^p d\mu = F, \tag{1.7}$$

This gives as an immediate result that extremal functions do not exist for the Bellman function. The core of this paper is the following: We prove a characterization of these extremal sequences of functions. In fact we prove

Theorem: Let$(\phi_n)_n$ be such that$\int_X \phi_n d\mu = f$ and $\int_X \phi_n^p d\mu = F$ Then it is extremal for (1.6), if and only if $\lim_n \int_X |\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi_n - c\phi_n|^p d\mu = 0$, for $c = \omega_p(f^p/F)$. □

We end this section with the following question.

We ask if there is essentially unique extremal sequence for (1.6). By this we mean the following: Does $\lim_n \int_X |\phi_n - g_n|^p d\mu = 0$ whenever $(\phi_n)_n$ and $(g_n)_n$ are extremal sequences for (1.6)?We hope to answer to this question in the near future.

2. Preliminaries

Let (X, μ) be a non-atomic probability measure space. We give the following from [3].

Definition 2.1. *A set $\mathcal{T}$ of measurable subsets of X will be called a tree if the following are satisfied*

- i) $X \in \mathcal{T}$ *and for every* $I \in \mathcal{T}$, $\mu(I) > 0$.
- ii) *For every $I \in \mathcal{T}$ there corresponds a finite or countable subset $C(I)$ of $\mathcal{T}$ containing at least two elements such that*
  - a) *the elements of $C(I)$ are pairwise disjoint subsets of I*
  - b) $I = \cup C(I)$.
- iii) $\mathcal{T} = \bigcup\limits_{m \geq 0} \mathcal{T}_{(m)}$, *where* $\mathcal{T}_{(0)} = \{X\}$ *and* $\mathcal{T}_{(m+1)} = \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{T}_{(m)}} C(I)$.
- iv) *The following holds*

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{I \in \mathcal{T}_{(m)}} \mu(I) = 0.$$

□

We state now the following lemma given in [3].

Lemma 2.1. *For every $I \in \mathcal{T}$ and every $a \in (0,1)$ there exists a subfamily $\mathcal{F}(I) \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ consisting of pairwise disjoint subsets of I such that*

$$\mu\Bigg(\bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{F}(I)} J \Bigg) = \sum_{J \in \mathcal{F}(I)} \mu(J) = (1-a)\mu(I).$$

□

Now given a tree $\mathcal{T}$ we define the maximal operator associated to it as follows

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi(x) = \sup\left\{ \frac{1}{\mu(I)} \int_I |\phi| d\mu : \ x \in I \in \mathcal{T} \right\}, \quad \text{for every} \quad \phi \in L^1(X, \mu).$$

From [3] we recall the following

Theorem 2.1. *The following holds:*

$$\sup\left\{ (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi)^p d\mu : \ \phi \geq 0, \ \int_X \phi d\mu = f, \ \int_X \phi^p d\mu = F \right\} = F\omega_p(f^p/F)^p,$$

for every f, F such that $0 < f^p \leq F$. □

At last we give the following

Definition 2.2. *Let $(\phi_n)_n$ be a sequence of μ-measurable nonnegative functions defined on X, $p > 1$ and $0 < f^p \leq F$. Then $(\phi_n)_n$ is called (p, f, F) extremal or simply extremal if the following hold:*

$$\int_X \phi_n d\mu = f, \ \int_X \phi_n^p d\mu = F \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_n \int_X (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi_n)^p d\mu = F\omega_p(f^p/F)^p.$$

□

3. Characterization of the extremal sequences

For the proof of the Theorem 2.1 an effective linearization for the operator $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}$ was introduced valid for certain functions ϕ. We describe it.

For $\phi \in L^1(X,\mu)$ nonnegative function and $I \in \mathcal{T}$ we define $Av_I(\phi) = \dfrac{1}{\mu(I)} \int_I \phi d\mu$.

We will say that ϕ is $\mathcal{T}$-good if the set

$$\mathcal{A}_\phi = \{x \in X : \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi(x) > Av_I(\phi) \ \text{ for all } \ I \in \mathcal{T} \ \text{ such that } \ x \in I\}$$

has μ-measure zero.

Let now ϕ be $\mathcal{T}$-good and $x \in X \setminus \mathcal{A}_\phi$.

We define $I_\phi(x)$ to be the largest in the nonempty set

$$\{I \in \mathcal{T} : \ x \in I \text{ and } \ \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi(x) = Av_I(\phi)\}.$$

Now given $I \in \mathcal{T}$ let

$$A(\phi, I) = \{x \in X \setminus \mathcal{A}_\phi : \ I_\phi(x) = I\} \subseteq I \ \text{ and}$$

$$S_\phi = \{I \in \mathcal{T} : \ \mu(A(\phi, I)) > 0\} \cup \{X\}.$$

Obviously, $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi = \sum\limits_{I \in S_\phi} Av_I(\phi) J_{A(\phi,I)}$, μ-a.e. where J_E is the characteristic function of E.

We define also the following correspondence $I \to I^*$ by: I^* is the smallest element of $\{J \in S_\phi : \ I \subsetneq J\}$. It is defined for every $I \in S_\phi$ except X. It is obvious that the $A(\phi, I)$'s are pairwise disjoint and that $\mu\Big(\bigcup\limits_{I \notin S_\phi} (A(\phi, I))\Big) = 0$, so that $\bigcup\limits_{I \in S_\phi} A(\phi, I) \approx X$, where by $A \approx B$ we mean that $\mu(A \setminus B) = \mu(B \setminus A) = 0$.

Now the following is true, obtained by [3].

Lemma 3.1. *Let ϕ be $\mathcal{T}$-good*

i) *If I, $J \in S_\phi$ then either $A(\phi, J) \cap I = \emptyset$ or $J \subseteq I$.*

ii) *If $I \in S_\phi$ then there exists $J \in C(I)$ such that $J \notin S_\phi$.*

iii) *For every $I \in S_\phi$ we have that*

$$I \approx \bigcup_{\substack{J \in S_\phi \\ J \subseteq I}} A(\phi, J).$$

iv) *For every $I \in S_\phi$ we have that*

$$A(\phi, I) = I \setminus \bigcup_{\substack{J \in S_\phi \\ J^* \in I}} J, \quad \textit{so that}$$

$$\mu(A(\phi, I)) = \mu(I) - \sum_{\substack{J \in S_\phi \\ J^* = I}} \mu(J).$$

□

From the above we see that

$$Av_I(\phi) = \frac{1}{\mu(I)} \sum_{\substack{J\in S_\phi \\ J\subseteq I}} \int_{A(\phi,J)} \phi d\mu =: y_I$$

$I \in S_\phi$, we define also

$$\chi_I = a_I^{-1+\frac{1}{p}} \int_{A(\phi,I)} \phi d\mu, \quad \text{for} I \in S_\phi, \quad \text{where} \ \ a_I = \mu(A(\phi, I)).$$

We prove now the following

Theorem 3.1. *Let ϕ be $\mathcal{T}$-good function such that $\int\limits_X \phi d\mu = f$. Let also $B = \{I_j\}$ be a family of pairwise disjoint elements of S_ϕ, which is maximal on S_ϕ under $\subseteq$ relation. That is if $I \in S_\phi$ then $I \cap (\cup I_j) \neq \emptyset$. (For example $B = \mathcal{T}_{(1)}$ satisfies this property).*

Then the following inequality holds:

$$\int_{X\setminus\bigcup\limits_j I_j} \phi^p \geq \frac{f^p - \sum\limits_j \mu(I_j) y_{I_j}^p}{(\beta+1)^{p-1}} + \frac{(p-1)\beta}{(\beta+1)^p} \int_{X\setminus\bigcup\limits_j I_j} (\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi)^p d\mu$$

for every $\beta > 0$, where $y_{I_j} = Av_{I_j}(\phi)$.

Proof. We follow [3].

We have that

$$\int_{X\setminus\cup I_j} \phi^p = \sum_{\substack{I\supsetneq \text{piece}(B) \\ I\in S_\phi}} \int_{A(\phi,I)} \phi^p d\mu, \tag{3.1}$$

where by writing $I \supsetneq \text{piece}(B)$ we mean that $I \supsetneq I_j$ for some j. Of course (3.1) is true since $X \setminus \bigcup\limits_j I_j \approx \bigcup\limits_{\substack{J\in S_\phi \\ I\supsetneq \text{piece}(B)}} A(\phi, I)$ in view of the maximality of B and Lemma 3.1.

Now from (3.1) we have by Holder's inequality that

$$\int_{X\setminus\bigcup\limits_j I_j} \phi^p d\mu \geq \sum_{\substack{I\in S_\phi \\ I\supsetneq \text{piece}(B)}} x_I^p = \sum_{\substack{I\in S_\phi \\ I\supsetneq \text{piece}(B)}} \frac{\Big(\int\limits_{A(\phi,I)} \phi d\mu\Big)^p}{a_I^{p-1}}. \tag{3.2}$$

Now, it is true that

$$\mu(I) y_I = \sum_{\substack{J\in S_\phi \\ J^*=I}} \mu(J) y_J + \int_{A(\phi,I)} \phi d\mu, \quad \text{for every} \ \ I \in S_\phi.$$

So by using Holder's inequality in the form

$$\frac{(\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_m)^p}{(\sigma_1 + \cdots + \sigma_m)^{p-1}} \leq \frac{\lambda_1^p}{\sigma_1^{p-1}} + \frac{\lambda_2^p}{\sigma_2^{p-1}} + \cdots + \frac{\lambda_n^p}{\sigma_m^{p-1}}, \quad \text{we have}$$

$$\int_{X\setminus\cup I_j}\phi^p \geq \sum_{\substack{I\in S_\phi\\ I\supsetneq \text{piece(B)}}} \frac{\left(\mu(I)y_I-\sum\limits_{J^*=I}\mu(J)y_J\right)^p}{\left(\mu(I)-\sum\limits_{J^*=I}\mu(J)\right)^{p-1}}$$

$$\geq \sum_{\substack{I\in S_\phi\\ I\supsetneq \text{piece(B)}}}\left\{\frac{(\mu(I)y_I)^p}{(\tau_I\mu(I))^{p-1}}-\sum_{J^*=I}\frac{(\mu(J)y_J)^p}{((\beta+1)\mu(J))^{p-1}}\right\}, \tag{3.3}$$

where $\tau_I=(\beta+1)-\beta\rho_I$, $\rho_I=\dfrac{a_I}{\mu(I)}$, $\beta>0$.

So by (3.3) we have because of the maximality of B that:

$$\int_{X\setminus\bigcup\limits_j I_j}\phi^p \geq \sum_{\substack{I\in S_\phi\\ I\supsetneq \text{piece}(B)}}\frac{\mu(I)y_I^p}{\tau_I^{p-1}}-\sum_{(*)}\frac{\mu(I)y_I^p}{(\beta+1)^{p-1}}, \tag{3.4}$$

where the summation in $(*)$ is extended to:

(a) $I\in S_\phi$: $I\supsetneq$ piece(B) with $I\neq X$, or (b)$I\in S_\phi$ is a piece of B ($I=I_j$, for some j).

So we can write:

$$\int_{X\setminus\cup I_j}\phi^p d\mu \geq \frac{y_x^p}{\tau_x^{p-1}}+\sum_{\substack{I\in S_\phi\\ I\neq X\\ I\supsetneq \text{ piece}(B)}}\frac{1}{\rho_I}\left(\frac{1}{\tau_I^{p-1}}\right.$$

$$\left.-\frac{1}{(\beta+1)^{p-1}}\right)a_I y_I^p-\frac{1}{(\beta+1)^{p-1}}\sum_j\mu(I_j)y_{I_j}^p. \tag{3.5}$$

It is true now that

$$\frac{1}{(\beta+1-\beta x)^{p-1}}-\frac{1}{(\beta+1)^{p-1}}\geq\frac{(p-1)\beta x}{(\beta+1)^p}, \tag{3.6}$$

for any $x\in[0,1]$.

Then (3.5) becomes

$$\int_{X\setminus\cup I_j}\phi^p d\mu \geq \frac{y_x^p}{\tau_x^{p-1}}+\frac{(p-1)\beta}{(\beta+1)^p}\sum_{\substack{I\neq X\\ I\in S_\phi\\ I\supsetneq \text{ piece}(B)}}a_I y_I^p-\frac{1}{(\beta+1)^{p-1}}\sum_j\mu(I_j)y_{I_j}^p$$

$$=\left[\frac{1}{((\beta+1)-\beta\rho_x)^{p-1}}-\frac{(p-1)\beta\rho_x}{(\beta+1)^p}\right]f^p+\frac{(p-1)\beta}{(\beta+1)^p}\sum_{\substack{I\in S_\phi\\ I\supsetneq \text{piece}(B)}}a_I y_I^p$$

$$-\frac{1}{(\beta+1)^{p-1}}\sum_j\mu(I_j)y_{I_j}^p, \tag{3.7}$$

But $\sum\limits_{\substack{I\in S_\phi \\ I\supsetneq \mathrm{piece}(B)}} a_I y_I^p = \sum\limits_{X\smallsetminus\cup I_j} (\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi)^p d\mu$, so in view of (3.6) we must have that

$$\int_{X\smallsetminus\cup I_j} \phi^p \geq \frac{f^p - \sum \mu(I_j) y_{I_j}^p}{(\beta+1)^{p-1}} + \frac{(p-1)\beta}{\beta+1)^p} \int_{X\smallsetminus\cup I_j} (\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi)^p d\mu,$$

for every $\beta > 0$, and the proof of the theorem is now complete. □

In the same lines as above we can prove:

Theorem 3.2. *Let ϕ be $\mathcal{T}$-good and $\mathcal{A} = \{I_j\}$ be a pairwise disjoint family of elements of S_ϕ. Then for every $\beta > 0$ we have that:*

$$\int_{\bigcup\limits_j I_j} \phi^p d\mu \geq \frac{\sum \mu(I_j) y_{I_j}^p}{(\beta+1)^{p-1}} + \frac{(p-1)\beta}{(\beta+1)^p} \int_{\bigcup\limits_j I_j} (\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi)^p d\mu.$$

□

We have now the following:

Corollary 3.1. *ϕ be a $\mathcal{T}$-good and $A = \{I_j\}$ be a pairwise disjoint family of elements of S_ϕ. Then for every $\beta > 0$*

$$\int_{X\smallsetminus\bigcup\limits_j I_j} \phi^p d\mu \geq \frac{f^p - \sum\limits_j \mu(I_j) y_{I_j}^p}{(\beta+1)^{p-1}} + \frac{(p-1)\beta}{(\beta+1)^p} \int_{X\smallsetminus\bigcup\limits_j I_j} (\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi)^p d\mu,$$

where $f = \int\limits_X \phi d\mu$.

Proof. Obvious, since there exist families $B, \varGamma$ of pairwise disjoint elements of S_ϕ with B as in the statement of Theorem 3.1, and $B = \bigcup\limits_j I'_j$, $\varGamma = \bigcup\limits_i J_i$ with $\bigcup\limits_j I'_j = \left(\bigcup\limits_j I_j\right) \cup \left(\bigcup\limits_i J_i\right)$ with the additional property that I_j disjoint to J_i for every j, i.

Applying Theorem 3.1 for B and 3.2 for $\varGamma$ we obtain Corollary 3.1. □

We have now the following

Theorem 3.3. *Let $(\phi_n)_n$ an extremal sequence consisting of $\mathcal{T}$-good functions. Consider for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ a pairwise disjoint family $\mathcal{A}_n = \{I_j^n\}$ of elements of S_{ϕ_n} such that the following limit exists*

$$\lim_n \sum_{I\in\mathcal{A}_n} \mu(I) y_{I,n}^p, \quad \text{where} \;\; y_{I,n} = Av_I(\varphi_n), \quad I \in \mathcal{A}_n.$$

Then

$$\lim_n \int_{\cup\mathcal{A}_n} (\mathcal{M}\phi_n)^p d\mu = \omega_p(f^p/F)^p \lim_n \int_{\cup\mathcal{A}_n} \phi_n^p d\mu$$

meaning that if one of the limits on the above relation exists then the other also does and we have the stated equality.

Proof. In view of Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 3.1 we have that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\int_{X \setminus \cup \mathcal{A}_n} \phi_n^p d\mu \geq \frac{f^p - \sum\limits_{I \in \mathcal{A}_n} \mu(I) y_{I,n}^p}{(\beta+1)^{p-1}} + \frac{(p-1)\beta}{(\beta+1)^p} \int_{X \setminus \cup \mathcal{A}_n} (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}} \phi_n)^p d\mu, \quad \text{and} \tag{3.8}$$

$$\int_{\cup \mathcal{A}_n} \phi_n^p d\mu \geq \frac{\sum_{I \in \mathcal{A}_n} \mu(I) y_{I,n}^p}{(\beta+1)^{p-1}} + \frac{(p-1)\beta}{(\beta+1)^p} \int_{\cup \mathcal{A}_n} (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}} \phi_n)^p d\mu, \tag{3.9}$$

or every $\beta > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Summing relations (3.8) and (3.9) for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we obtain

$$F = \int_X \phi_n^p d\mu \geq \frac{f^p}{(\beta+1)^{p-1}} + \frac{(p-1)\beta}{(\beta+1)^p} \int_X (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}} \phi_n)^p d\mu, \tag{3.10}$$

Since $(\phi_n)_n$ is extremal we have equality in the limit in (3.10) for $\beta = \omega_p(f^p/F) - 1$ (see [3]).

So we must have equality on (3.8) and (3.9) in the limit for this value of β.

Suppose now that $h_n = \sum\limits_{I \in \mathcal{A}_n} \mu(I) y_{I,n}^p$ and that $h_n \to h$ (3.9) now can be written in the form

$$\int_{\cup \mathcal{A}_n} (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}} \phi_n)^p d\mu \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{\beta}\right) \frac{(\beta+1)^{p-1} \int\limits_{\cup \mathcal{A}_n} \phi_n^p - h_n}{p-1}, \tag{3.11}$$

(see [3], relations (4.24) and (4.25)), for every $\beta > 0$ The right hand side of (3.11), $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is minimized for $\beta = \beta_n = \omega_p\Big(h_n / \int\limits_{\cup \mathcal{A}_n} \phi_n^p\Big) - 1$.

Since, we have equality in the limit in (3.11) we must have that

$$\lim_n \frac{h_n}{\int\limits_{\cup \mathcal{A}_n} \phi_n^p d\mu} = \frac{f^p}{F}, \tag{3.12}$$

Thus (3.12) and (3.11) now give

$$\lim_n \int_{\cup \mathcal{A}_n} (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}} \phi_n)^p d\mu = \omega_p(f^p/F)^p \lim_n \int_{\cup \mathcal{A}_n} \phi_n^p$$

in the sense stated above. □

The theorem just proved is the core for proving the characterization we need for each extremal sequence. We just need some Lemmas that we are going to state and prove below.

We give now some notation.

Let ϕ be $\mathcal{T}$-good. For each $I \in S_\phi$ we consider the set $A_I = \mathcal{A}(\phi, I)$ is a union of elements of $\mathcal{T}$, because of the definition of tree $\mathcal{T}$ and Lemma 3.1 iv). Using now Lemma 2.1 we construct for each $a \in (0,1)$ a pairwise disjoint family $\mathcal{A}_\phi^I$ of elements of $\mathcal{T}$ and subset

$$\sum_{J \in A_\phi^I} \mu(J) = a\mu(A_I). \tag{3.13}$$

We define the following function $g_\phi : X \to \mathbb{R}^+$ in the following way. For each $I \in S_\phi$ we define:

$$
\begin{aligned}
g_\phi &:= c_I^\phi, && \text{on} \quad \cup A_\phi^I \\
&:= 0, && \text{on} \quad A_I \setminus \cup A_\phi^I
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.14}
$$

such that

$$
\left.\begin{aligned}
&\textstyle\int_{A_I} g_\phi d\mu = c_I^\phi \gamma_I^\phi = \int\limits_{A_I} \phi d\mu \ \text{ and} \\
&\int\limits_{A_I} g_\phi^p d\mu = (c_I^\phi)^p \gamma_I^\phi = \int\limits_{A_I} \phi^p d\mu,
\end{aligned}\right\}, \text{ where } \gamma_I^\phi = \mu(\cup A_\phi^I) = a\mu(A_I).
\tag{3.15}
$$

It is easy to see that such chases of γ_I^ϕ and c_I^ϕ, for every $I \in S_p$ are possible.

In fact (3.15) give

$$
\gamma_I^\phi = \left[\frac{\left(\int\limits_{A_I} \phi d\mu \right)^p}{\int\limits_{A_I} \phi^p d\mu} \right]^{1/(p-1)} \le \mu(A_I), \quad \text{by Holder's inequality}
$$

so we just need to set

$$
a = \frac{1}{\mu(A_I)} \left[\frac{\left(\int\limits_{A_I} \phi d\mu \right)^p}{\int\limits_{A_I} \phi^p d\mu} \right]^{1/(p-1)} .
$$

Then, if A_ϕ^I is such that (3.13) is satisfied for this a, by setting $\gamma_I^\phi = a\mu(A_I)$ and $c_I^\phi = \dfrac{\int\limits_{A_I} \phi d\mu}{\gamma_I^\phi}$, we have that (3.15) are valid.

Since $\bigcup\limits_{I \in S_\phi} A_I \approx X$, g_ϕ is well defined on X.

It is obvious that $\int\limits_X \phi d\mu = f$ and $\int\limits_X g_\phi^p d\mu = F$ It is easy also to see that for every $I \in S_\phi$ it holds

$$
\mu(\{g_\phi = 0\} \cap A_I) \ge \mu(\{\phi = 0\} \cap A_I)
$$

Therefore by 3.1, $\mu(\{\phi = 0\}) \le \mu(\{g_\phi = 0\})$.

Let now $(\phi_n)_n$ be an extremal sequence consisting of $\mathcal{T}$-good functions and let $g_n = g_{\phi_n}$. We prove now the following

Lemma 3.2. *For an extremal* $(\phi_n)_n$ *sequence of* $\mathcal{T}$*-good functions we have that* $\lim_n(\{\phi_n = 0\}) = 0$.

Proof. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\phi = \phi_n$ and $g_\phi = g_{\phi_n}$ and $S = S_\phi$ the respective subtree of ϕ.

We consider two cases:

i) $p \ge 2$

We set $P_I = \dfrac{\int\limits_{A_I} \phi^p d\mu}{a_I}$, for every $I \in S_\phi$.

We obviously have $\sum\limits_{I\in S_\phi} a_I P_I = F$, we consider now the sum $\varSigma_\phi = \sum\limits_{I\in S_\phi} \gamma_I P_I$, where $\gamma_I = \gamma_I^\phi$ as above. Then

$$\varSigma_\phi = \sum_{I\in S_\phi} \gamma_I \frac{\int\limits_{A_I} \phi^p}{a_I} = \sum_{I\in S_\phi} \gamma_I \frac{\gamma_I \cdot c_I^p}{a_I} = \sum_{I\in S_\phi} \gamma_I^2 \frac{c_I^p}{a_I} = \sum_{I\in S_\phi} \frac{\gamma_I^2 a_I^{p-2} c_I^p}{a_I^{p-1}}$$

$$\overset{p\geq 2}{\geq} \sum_{I\in S_\phi} \frac{(\gamma_I c_I)^p}{a_I^{p-1}} = \sum_{I\in S_\phi} \frac{\Big(\int\limits_{A_I} \phi\Big)^p}{a_I^{p-1}}.$$

From the first inequality in (4.20) in [3], and since ϕ_n is extremal we have that the last sum in the last inequality tends to F, as ϕ moves along $(\phi_n)_n$. We then write

$$\sum_{I\in S_p} \gamma_I P_I \approx F \tag{3.16}$$

since $\varSigma_\phi \leq F$. Consider now for every $R > 0$ and every ϕ the following set

$$S_{\phi,R} = \cup\{A_I = A(\phi, I) :\ I \in S_\phi,\quad P_I < R\}.$$

For every $I \in S_\phi$ such that $P_I < R$ we have that $\int\limits_{A_I} \phi^p < R a_I$. Summing for all such I we obtain

$$\int_{S_{\phi,R}} \phi^p < R\mu(S_{\phi,R}). \tag{3.17}$$

Additionally we have that

$$\Bigg| \sum_{\substack{I\in S_\phi \\ P_I \geq R}} a_I P_I - F \Bigg| = \int_{S_{\phi,R}} \phi^p d\mu, \quad \text{and} \tag{3.18}$$

$$\sum_{\substack{I\in S_\phi \\ P_I < R}} \gamma_I P_I \leq \sum_{\substack{I\in S_\phi \\ P_I < R}} a_I P_I \leq \int_{S_{\phi,R}} \phi^p d\mu. \tag{3.19}$$

From (3.15) and (3.19) we have that

$$\limsup_\phi \Bigg| \sum_{\substack{I\in S_\phi \\ P_I \geq R}} \gamma_I P_I - F \Bigg| \leq \lim_\phi \int_{S_{\phi,R}} \phi^p, \tag{3.20}$$

where we have supposed that the last limit exists (we just pass to a subsequence of $(\phi_n)_n$. From (3.18) and (3.20) we conclude that

$$\limsup_\phi \sum_{\substack{I\in S_\phi \\ P_I \geq R}} (a_I - \gamma_I) P_I \leq 2 \lim_\phi \int_{S_{\phi,R}} \phi^p. \tag{3.21}$$

But using Theorem 3.3 we know that

$$\lim_{\phi} \int_{K_\phi} (\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi)^p d\mu = \omega_p(f^p/F)^p \lim_{\phi} \int_{K\phi} \phi^p,$$

whenever the limits exist, where K_ϕ is a union of pairwise disjoint elements of S_ϕ. (The conditions of Theorem 3.3 are satisfied because of the boundedness of the sequences mentioned there).

Now for a fixed $R > 0$, $S_{\phi,R}$ is a union of sets of the form A_I, for certain $I \in S_\phi$. Each A_I can be written in view of Lemma 3.1 as $A_I = I \setminus \bigcup\limits_{J \in S_\phi} J$. Using then a diagonal argument and passing if necessary to a subsequence we can suppose that

$$\lim_{\phi} \int_{S_{\phi,R}} (\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi)^p d\mu = \omega_p(f^p/F)^p \lim_{\phi} \int_{S_{\phi,R}} \phi^p, \tag{3.22}$$

of course $\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi(t) \geq f$, for every $t \in X$, so that

$$\lim_{\phi} \int_{S_{\phi,R}} (\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi)^p d\mu \geq (\limsup_{\phi} \mu(S_{\phi,R})) f^p, \tag{3.23}$$

and because of (3.17) we have that

$$\lim_{\phi} \int_{S_{\phi,R}} \phi^p d\mu \leq \limsup_{\phi} R\mu(S_{\phi,R}), \tag{3.24}$$

for any $R > 0$. Thus, from the last two relations (in view of (3.22)) we obtain that

$$f^p(\limsup_{\phi} \mu(S_{\phi,R})) \leq R\omega_p(f^p/F)^p \cdot (\limsup_{\phi} \mu(S_{\phi,R})), \tag{3.25}$$

so by choosing $R > 0$ suitable small depending only on f, F we have that

$$\limsup_{\phi} \mu(S_{\phi,R}) = 0. \tag{3.26}$$

Using now (3.21) and (3.24) we obtain, for this R:

$$R \limsup_{\phi} \sum_{\substack{I \in S_\phi \\ P_I \geq R}} (a_I - \gamma_I) \leq 2 \lim_{\phi} \int_{S_{\phi,R}} \phi^p \leq 2R \lim_{\phi} \mu(S_{\phi,R}) = 0$$

Thus

$$\lim_{\phi} \sum_{\substack{I \in S_\phi \\ P_I \geq R}} (a_I - \gamma_I) = 0. \tag{3.27}$$

Since now $\sum\limits_{I\in S_\phi} a_I = 1$, $\mu(S_{\phi,R}) = \sum\limits_{\substack{I\in S_\phi\\ P_I<R}} a_I$ we easily obtain from (3.27) that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_\phi \left[1-\mu(S_{\phi,R}) - \sum_{\substack{I\in S_\phi\\ P_I\geq R}} \gamma_I\right] = 0 \ \Rightarrow \\
&\lim_\phi \sum_{\substack{I\in S_\phi\\ P_I\geq R}} \gamma_I = 1, \quad \text{which gives of course:} \\
&\lim_\phi \sum_{I\in S_\phi} (a_I-\gamma_I) = 0. \ \text{ But then we have that}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\mu(\{\phi=0\}) \leq \mu(\{g_\phi=0\}) = \sum_{I\in S_\phi} (a_I-\gamma_I) \xrightarrow{\phi} 0,$$

Lemma 3.1 is proved in case where $p \geq 2$.

ii) The case $1<p<2$ is treated in the same way:

Here we define $P_I = \dfrac{\int_{A_I} \phi^p}{a_I^{p-1}}$ and prove in the same manner that

$$\lim_\phi \sum_{I\in S_\phi} (a_I^{p-1} - \gamma_I^{p-1}) P_I = 0.$$

Using then the inequality $x^q - y^q > q(x-y)$, for $1>x>y$ and $0<q<1$, we conclude that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_\phi \sum_{I\in S_\phi} (a_I-\gamma_I) = 0, \quad \text{that is} \\
&\lim_\phi \mu(\{g_\phi=0\}) = 0, \quad \text{and so} \\
&\lim_\phi \mu(\{\phi=0\}) = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

and Lemma 3.1 is proved. □

Suppose now that $(\phi_n)_n$ is extremal. We remind that for every $\phi\in\{\phi_n,\ n=1,2,\ldots\}$ we have defined $g_\phi : X \to \mathbb{R}^+$ by the following

$$\begin{aligned}
g_\phi(t) &:= c_I^\phi, \quad t\in \cup A_\phi^I \\
&:= 0, \ t\in (A_I \setminus \cup A_\phi^I), \quad I\in S_\phi \ \text{ with}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\gamma_I = \gamma_I^\phi = \mu(\cup A_\phi^I) \ \text{ and } \ \mu(\{g_\phi=0\}) = \sum_{I\in S_\phi} (a_I-\gamma_I) \xrightarrow{\phi} 0.$$

$a_I = \mu(A_I)$, where $A_I = A(\phi, I)$.

So, if we define $g'_\phi : x \to \mathbb{R}^+$ by $g'_\phi(t) = c_I^\phi$, $t\in A_I$ for $I\in S_\phi$ we easily see that:

$$\lim_\phi \int_X g'_\phi d\mu = f, \ \ \lim_\phi \int_X (g'_\phi)^p d\mu = F \ \text{ and}$$

$$\lim_\phi \int_X |g_\phi - g'_\phi|^p d\mu = 0. \tag{3.28}$$

Additionally because of $\int\limits_{A_I} g_\phi d\mu = \int\limits_{A_I} \phi d\mu$, $I \in S_\phi$ and $I \approx \bigcup\limits_{\substack{J\in S_\phi \\ J\subseteq I}} A(\phi, J)$ we have that for every $I \in S_\phi$

$$Av_I(g_\phi) = Av_I(\phi). \tag{3.29}$$

From (3.29) we have that $\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T} g_\phi \geq \mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T} \phi$ on $X \Rightarrow \lim\limits_\phi \int\limits_X (\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T} g_\phi)^p d\mu = F\omega_p(f^p/F)^p$, in view of (3.15) and Theorem 2.1.

Since $\int\limits_X g_\phi d\mu = f$, $\int\limits_X (g_\phi)^p d\mu = F$ we have that $(g_\phi)_\phi$ is an extremal sequence. Suppose now that we have proven the following

$$\lim_\phi \int_X |g'_\phi - \phi|^p d\mu = 0, \tag{3.30}$$

and that

$$\lim_\phi \int_X |\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T} g_\phi - c g_\phi|^p d\mu = 0, \quad \text{for} \quad c = \omega_p(f^p/F) \tag{3.31}$$

then because of (3.28) we would have that

$$\lim_\phi \int_X |\phi - g_\phi|^p d\mu = 0 \overset{(3.31)}{\Rightarrow}$$

$$\lim_\phi \int_X |\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T} \phi - c\phi|^p d\mu = 0$$

that is what we wanted to prove. We proceed to the proof of (3.30) and (3.31).

Proof of (3.31). We consider now the sequence $(g_\phi)_\phi$.

We remind that $c = \omega_p(f^p/F)$. Applying Theorem 3.3 we have that if A_ϕ is pairwise disjoint family of sets in S_{g_ϕ}, for every ϕ, then

$$\lim_\phi \int_{A_\phi} (\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T} g_\phi)^p d\mu = c^p \lim_\phi \int_{A_\phi} g_\phi^p d\mu, \tag{3.32}$$

under the hypothesis that the above limits exist.

We set for each ϕ, $\varDelta_\phi = \{t \in X : \ \mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T} g_\phi(t) \geq c g_\phi(t)\}$.

We consider now for every $I \in S_\phi$ the set $\varDelta_\phi \cap A_I$. Since g_ϕ is either c_I^ϕ or 0 on A_I and $\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi(t) \geq f > 0$, $\forall\, t \in X$ we conclude that $\varDelta_\phi \cap A_I = A_I$ or $\varDelta_\phi \cap A_I = A_I \setminus \cup A_\phi^I$.

We remind that $\sum\limits_{I\in S_\phi} (a_I - \gamma_I) \xrightarrow{\phi} 0$ or $\sum\limits_{I\in S_\phi} \mu(A_I \setminus \cup A_I^\phi) \xrightarrow{\phi} 0$.

Since $\bigcup\limits_{I\in S_\phi} A_I \approx X$ we have that

$$\varDelta_\phi = \Bigg(\bigcup_{I\in S_{1,\phi}} A_I \Bigg) \cup (E_\phi), \quad \text{where} \quad \mu(E_\phi) \xrightarrow{\phi} 0$$

and $S_{1,\phi}$ is a subset of the subtree S_ϕ.

According to the same reasons mentioned before we have, by passing if necessary to a subsequence, that

$$\lim_{\phi}\int_{\substack{\cup A_I\\ I\in S_{1,\phi}}}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi)^p d\mu=\omega_p(f^p/F)^p\cdot\lim_{\phi}\int_{\substack{\cup A_I\\ I\in S_{1,\phi}}}\phi^p,\quad\text{so since}$$

$$\mu(E_\phi)\ \to\ 0:\lim_{\phi}\int_{\Delta_\phi}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi)^p d\mu=\omega_p(f^p/F)^p\lim_{\phi}\int_{\Delta_\phi}\phi^p.$$

Because of (3.15), the consequence that $Av_I(\phi)=Av_I(g_\phi)$, for every $I\in S_\phi$ and Lemma 3.1 iii), we obtain that (passing again to a subsequence if necessary)

$$\lim_{\phi}\int_{\Delta_\phi}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}g_\phi)^p d\mu\geq\omega_p(f^p/F)^p\lim_{\phi}\int_{\Delta_\phi}g_\phi^p. \tag{3.33}$$

In the same way we have that

$$\lim_{\phi}\int_{X\setminus\Delta_\phi}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}g_\phi)^p d\mu\geq\omega_p(f^p/F)^p\lim_{\phi}\int_{X\setminus\Delta_\phi}g_\phi^p d\mu. \tag{3.34}$$

Adding the last two relations one obtain $\lim\limits_{\phi}\int\limits_X(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi)^p d\mu\geq\omega_p(f^p/F)^pF$, which is in fact equality since g_ϕ is an extremal sequence.

So, we must have equality in both (3.33) and (3.34). Since $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}g_\phi\geq\omega_p(f^p/F)g_\phi$ on Δ_ϕ, we obtain easily from the above relations that

$$\lim_{\phi}\int_X|\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}g_\phi-cg_\phi|^p d\mu=0.$$

which is (3.31).

We now proceed to the second proof

Proof of (3.30). We prove that $\lim\limits_{\phi}\int\limits_X|g'_\phi-\phi|^p d\mu=0$.

We just need to prove that

$$\lim_{\phi}\int_{\{g'_\phi\leq\phi\}}[\phi^p-(g'_\phi)^p]d\mu=0. \tag{3.35}$$

Then since

$$\lim_{\phi}\int_{\{g'_\phi\leq\phi\}}[\phi^p-(g'_\phi)^p]d\mu=\lim_{\phi}\int_{\phi\leq g'_\phi}[(g'_\phi)^p-\phi^p],\quad\text{and}\quad p>1$$

we are finished, in view of the inequality $(x-y)^p<x^p-y^p$, for $0<y<x$ and $p>1$.

We use the inequality

$$t\leq\frac{t^p}{p}+\frac{1}{q},\ \text{for every } t>0 \text{ where } p,q>1 \text{ such that } \frac{1}{p}+\frac{1}{q}=1, \tag{3.36}$$

We set

$$\Delta^{(1)}_{I,\phi}=\{g'_\phi\leq\phi\}\cap A(\phi,I)$$
$$\Delta^{(2)}_{I,\phi}=\{\phi\leq g'_\phi\}\cap A(\phi,I).$$

Because of (3.36) we have that if $c_{I,\phi} > 0$

$$\frac{1}{c_{I,\phi}}\phi(x) \le \frac{1}{p}\frac{1}{c_{I,\phi}^{p}}\phi^{p}(x) + \frac{1}{q}, \quad \text{for every} \ \ x \in A_I = A(\phi, I).$$

Integrating over $\varDelta^{(1)}_{I,\phi}$, and $\varDelta^{(2)}_{I,\phi}$ we have that

$$\frac{1}{c_{I,\phi}}\int_{\varDelta^{(j)}_{I,\phi}} \phi d\mu \le \frac{1}{p}\frac{1}{c_{I,\phi}^{p}}\int_{\varDelta^{(j)}_{I,\phi}} \phi^{p} d\mu + \frac{1}{q}\mu(\varDelta^{(j)}_{I,\phi}), \quad \text{for} \ \ j = 1, 2, \quad I \in S_\phi$$

which gives

$$c_{I,\phi}^{p-1}\int_{\varDelta^{(j)}_{I,p}} \phi d\mu \le \frac{1}{p}\int_{\varDelta^{(j)}_{I,\phi}} \phi^{p} d\mu + \frac{1}{q}\mu(\varDelta^{(j)}_{I,\phi})c_{I,\phi}^{p}.$$

Note that the last inequality is satisfied even if $c_{I,\phi} = 0$. Summing the above for $I \in S_\phi$ we obtain

$$\sum_{I\in S_\phi} c_{I,\phi}^{p-1}\int_{\varDelta^{(j)}_{I,\phi}} \phi d\mu \le \frac{1}{p}\int_{\bigcup\limits_{I} \varDelta^{(j)}_{I,\phi}} \phi^{p} + \frac{1}{q}\sum_{I\in S_\phi} \mu(\varDelta^{(j)}_{I,\phi})c_{I,\phi}^{p}, \tag{3.37}$$

for $j = 1, 2 \Rightarrow$ (by adding the above to inequalities)

$$\sum_{I\in S_\phi} c_{I,\phi}^{p-1}\int_{A(\phi,I)} \phi d\mu \le \frac{1}{p}F + \frac{1}{q}\sum_{I\in S_\phi} \mu(A(\phi,I))c_{I,\phi}^{p}. \tag{3.38}$$

The left hand side of (3.38) is equal to

$$\sum c_{I,\phi}^{p-1}(c_{I,\phi}\gamma_I^{\phi}) = \sum \gamma_I^{\phi} c_{I,\phi}^{p} = \int_X g_\phi^{p}$$

while the right hand side is equal to $\frac{1}{p}F + \frac{1}{q}\int\limits_X (g'_\phi)^p d\mu$. In the limit we have equality on (3.38), because of (3.28). This gives equality on (3.37) in the limit. This is

$$\sum_{I\in S_\phi} c_{I,\phi}^{p-1}\int_{\varDelta^{(1)}_{I,\phi}} \phi d\mu \approx \frac{1}{p}\sum_{I\in S_\phi}\int_{\varDelta^{(1)}_{I,\phi}} \phi^{p} d\mu + \frac{1}{q}\sum_{I\in S_\phi} c_{I,\phi}^{p}\mu(\varDelta^{(1)}_{I,\phi}) \Rightarrow$$

$$\int_{\{g'_\phi\le\phi\}} \phi(g'_\phi)^{p-1} d\mu \approx \frac{1}{p}\int_{\{g'_\phi\le\phi\}} \phi^{p} d\mu + \frac{1}{q}\int_{\{g'_\phi\le\phi\}} g^{p} d\mu. \tag{3.39}$$

We set

$$t_\phi = \left(\int_{\{g'_\phi\le\phi\}} \phi^{p}\right)^{1/p}, \quad S_\phi = \left(\int_{\{g'_\phi\le\phi\}} (g'_\phi)^{p} d\mu\right)^{1/p}.$$

But

$$\int_{\{g'_\phi\le\phi\}} \phi(g'_\phi)^{p-1} d\mu \le t_\phi \cdot S_\phi^{p-1}, \quad \text{so (3.39) gives:}$$

$$\frac{1}{p}t_\phi^{p} + \frac{1}{q}S_\phi^{p} \underset{\phi}{\le} t_\phi \cdot S_\phi^{p-1}$$

which gives because of (3.36)

$$\frac{1}{p}t_\phi^{p} + \frac{1}{q}S_\phi^{p} \underset{\phi}{\approx} t_\phi \cdot S_\phi^{p-1}.$$

Since now in (3.36) we have equality only for $t > 1$, and t_ϕ, S_ϕ are bounded we conclude that

$$\frac{t_\phi^p}{S_\phi^p} \underset{\phi}{\longrightarrow} 1, \quad \text{so} \quad t_\phi^p - S_\phi^p \xrightarrow{\phi} 0 \Rightarrow \int_{\{g'_\phi \leq \phi\}} [\phi^p - (g'_\phi)^p] d\mu \xrightarrow{\phi} 0,$$

that is (3.35). We have just proved the following

Theorem 3.4. *Let* $(\phi_n)_n$ *be a sequence of* $\mathcal{T}$*-good functions such that* $\int_X \phi_n d\mu = f$ *and* $\int_X \phi_n^p d\mu = F$*. Then* $(\phi_n)_n$ *is extremal if and only if*

$$\lim_n \int_X |\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi_n - c\phi_n|^p d\mu = 0, \quad \textit{where} \quad c = \omega_p(f^p/F).$$

□

At last we mention that since $\mathcal{T}$-good functions include $\mathcal{T}$-step functions, in the case of $\mathbb{R}^n$, where the Bellman function is given by (1.4) for a fixed dyadic cube Q, we obtain the result in Theorem 3.4 for every sequence of Lesbesque measurable functions $(\phi_n)_n$. In general in all interesting cases we do not need the hypothesis for ϕ_n to be $\mathcal{T}$-good since $\mathcal{T}$-simple functions are dense on $L^p(X, \mu)$.

References

[1] D. L. Burkholder Martingales and Fourier Analysis in Banach spaces, C.I.M.E. Lectures Varenna, Como, Italy, 1985, *Lecture Notes Math.* **1206** (1987) 61-108.

[2] D. L. Burkholder, Explorations in martingale theory and its applications, École d' Eté de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XIX-1989, *Lectur. Notes Math.* 1464 (1991) 1-66.

[3] A. D. Mellas. The Bellman functions of dyadic-like maximal operators and related inequalities, *Adv. in Math.* **192** (2005) 310-340.

[4] A. D. Melas, Sharp general local estimates for dyadic-like maximal operators and related Bellman functions, *Adv. in Math.* **220** (2009) 367-426.

[5] E. Nikolidakis, Extremal problems related to maximal dyadic like operators, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **369** (2010) 377-385.

[6] E. Nikolidakis, Sharp weak type inequalities for the dyadic maximal operator, *J.Fourier. Anal. Appl.* (October 2012).

[7] E. Nikolidakis, Optimal weak type estimates for dyadic-like maximal operators,To appear in Ann.Ac.Sc.Fenn.Math.

[8] E. Nikolidakis, Properties of extremal sequences for the Bellman function of the dyadic maximal operator, arXiv:1109.4924v1.

[9] L. Slavin, A. Stokolos, V. Vasiumin, Monge-Ampère equations and Bellman dunctions: The dyadic maximal operators. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér.* **346** (2008), 585-588, MR 2412802.

[10] G. Wang, Sharp maximal inequalities for conditionally symmetric martingales and Brownian motion, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **112** (1991) 579-586.

Department of Mathematics University of Crete 71409, Heraklion, Crete Greece
E-mail address:lefteris@math.uoc.gr